

(D) REMARKS

Favorable entry and consideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3 and 5-16 are pending herein. New claims 13-16 have been added to emphasize the feature of a polymer including a plurality of repeat units and its general morphology.

In addition, Applicants' representative conducted a telephone conference with the Examiner informing him that Applicants were preparing a Declaration that would not be ready to submit until after this Request for Continued Examination (RCE) was filed, but expressing Applicants desire for the Declaration to be ensured entry and consideration. This confirms with appreciation, Examiner Krishnan's assurance that the Declaration will be considered if it is filed within one month after the filing date of this RCE.

Dated: December 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul A. Serbinowski', with a stylized, cursive script.

Paul A. Serbinowski
Reg. No. 34,429

January 21, 2004

DRAFT

Paul A. Serbinowski, Esq.
Pearne & Gordon LLP
Ohio Savings Bldg.
1801, E. 9th Street
12 th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-3108

Re: Response to Office Action on US Patent Application 09/961,441

Dear Paul:

Thank you for your letter of December 10, 2003 regarding Office Action on the application referenced above, your reference KENT.35601

Reading the Maeda US Patent 6,285,422, I find little similarity to our application other than they do both describe a transfective display. As you point out in your letter the Maeda patent is on different display technologies and provides no teaching on the cholesteric reflective technologies in which the optics are very different. The Maeda patent makes use of an optical device they call a "polarized light separator 16". They describe different embodiments of this light separator. And while one of those embodiments contains a cholesteric liquid crystal, we do not have such a device in our display. Our transfecting display consists instead of an ambidextrous circular polarizer and other elements. The Maeda patent has no ambidextrous circular polarizer.

With regard to the Azo patent (754), the Examiner may have been confused by section in the KDI application entitled "Polarization Measurement". This section provides instruction to the reader regarding the parameter S3. The Azo patent on the other hand describes an optics measurement device used to measure polarization characteristics and provides no teaching of the KDI cholesteric transfective display.

Sincerely,



"Express Mail" Mailing Label Certificate

Re: Application of Hirofumi Yura et al.
Serial No. 09/937,991
Filed: 01/23/2002
Title: FUNCTIONALIZED GLYCOSAMINOGLYCAN POLYMER AND
MEDICAL INSTRUMENTS AND DRUGS BY USING THE SAME
Attorney Docket: 33944

Express Mail Label No. EV 081247965US

Date of Deposit: December 20, 2004

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail to "Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Mail Stop RCE, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Ellen M. Grzelak
Printed Name of Person
12/20/04
Signature of Person